REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 18 are Patentable Over the Cited

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 18 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(b)) by Davis (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,259). Applicants traverse.

Amended claims 1, 7, and 13 concern converting in a computer system a text representation of a number into a numeric representation of the number, and requires: maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to convertors; converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format; mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the covertor comprises a sequence of conversion code; and executing the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code.

Applicants amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to recite maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to converters, mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the convertor comprises a sequence of conversion code, and executing the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 11-12 of the Specification and FIGs. 1-3.

Applicants further amended claim 13 to recite that the format generator transforms the textual representation into the description of the number's format and amended the last limitation to clarify the language in view of the amendments. These added requirements are disclosed on pg. 11 of the Specification.

During the phone interview, Applicants discussed the above amendments and how they distinguish over the cited art. The Examiner indicated that such amendments may distinguish over the cited art, but that further consideration was needed and that the Examiner would not enter the above amendments after final because such amendments would necessitate further searching and consideration. Applicants submit that the amended claims 1, 7, and 13 distinguish over the cited art for the following reasons.

The Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses the added requirement of maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to converters and then mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format.

For instance, the cited col. 3, lines 50-67 mentions that number formatting classes convert text to a TCanonicalNumber format 204 and then using the TCanonicalNumberFormatter to perform the conversion to the binary level. However, the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis disclosing a correspondence of different converters comprising a sequence of conversion code to number format descriptions.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53, col. 5, lines 48-50, and the TCanonicalNumber of Davis as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. (Final Office Action, pg. 3, 7) Applicants traverse.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner found that the TCanonicalNumber is linked to a formatter and converted to the binary level by a TCanonicalNumber. The Examiner then found that the "binary level is a description of the number's format". (Final Office Action, pg. 7). Applicants traverse this finding because the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the cited "binary level" is a description of the number's format as the Examiner contends. In fact, Davis indicates that the binary level is the ultimate result of the conversion, where the TCanonicalNumber is converted to the binary level, see, col. 3, lines 46-60, not a description of the number's format as claimed.

Further, the cited col. 3 mentions that number formatting classes convert text to a TCanonicalNumber 204 and then uses a TCanonicalNumberFormatter to perform the further conversion to the binary level. The cited col. 5 mentions turning text into a number. Each number formatter attempts to turn text to a number by itself. Further, claim 3 of Davis mentions converting text to a standard intermediate form and that the canonical number formatter includes at least one method for converting the standard intermediate form to at least one binary number.

Although the cited cols. 3 and 5 discuss converting text to a TCanonicalNumber or standard intermediate form, and text to a number, nowhere has the Examiner cited any part of Davis that discloses that the TCanonicalNumber or the "standard intermediate form" comprises a text representation of the number. Further, Davis mentions that the TCanonicalNumber is an object having a class used to convert text, not a description of the number's format as claimed.

(col. 3, lines 47-52, col. 15, lines 40-45) Applicants further note that in the Response to
Arguments, the Examiner did not find that the TCanonicalNumber comprises the claimed
description of the number's format, but instead found that the binary level is the claimed
description of the number's format. Applicants explained above why the "binary level" does not
comprise a description of the number's format but is instead the binary result of the conversion.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53 and col. 15, lines 41-60 of Davis as disclosing pre-
amended claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of
conversion code. (Final Office Action, pgs. 3, 7) Applicants traverse with respect to the
amended limitation requiring mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor
corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the covertor comprises a
sequence of conversion code

As discussed, the cited col. 3 mentions converting text to a TCanonicalNumber. The
Examiner found that the TCanonicalNumber is a description of the number's format. Applicants
submit that the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the
TCanonicalNumber is a description of a number's format.

Further, the cited col. 3 mentions using a TCanonicalNumberFormatter to perform further
conversion to the binary level. Nowhere does this discussion of a number formatter anywhere
disclose the added claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to one
of a plurality of converters, where there is a correspondence of convertors to number formats.

The cited col. 15 mentions that developers who write their own TNumberFormat objects
need to write methods to convert text to and from the TCanonicalNumberFormatter format.
Nowhere does this cited col. 15 anywhere disclose the claim requirement of mapping the
description of the number's format to a convertor corresponding to a description of the number's
format. Instead, the cited col. 15 mentions that a method converts text to and from the
TCanonicalNumberFormatter format. There is no disclosure of mapping a description of the
numbers format to a convertor, where there is a correspondence of number format descriptions to
converters.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53, 65-67, col. 4, lines 1-2, col. 5, lines 48-50, and
col. 15, lines 54-60 as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the text representation of
the number into the numeric representation. (Office Action, pg. 3, 8) Applicants traverse with
respect to the amended claim requirement requiring executing the convertor corresponding to the

description of the number's format to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code.

The cited sections of Davis discuss how text is converted to a number by converting the text to a TCanonicalNumber and then to a binary level via a TCanonicalNumberFormatter. Nowhere does this cited Davis disclose executing one of a plurality of convertors that corresponds to number format descriptions to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number. Instead, the cited Davis discusses how the TCanonicalNumberFormatter processes a TCanonicalNumber, not executing a convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format to convert the text representation of the number as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Davis does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, and 18 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 4, 10, and 16 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that the sequence of conversion code for converting the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number comprises an assignment statement.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 40-62, col. 10, lines 7-22, and col. 15, lines 41-52 of Davis as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 4 and 8-9) The cited cols. 9 and 10 show methods of the TPositionalNumberFormat and TFloatingPointFormat that are used to format a number. However, these cited cols. 9-10 do not disclose that the sequence of conversion code for converting comprises an assignment statement. Instead, the cited cols. 9-10 discuss methods for formatting.

The cited col. 15 also mentions methods to convert text from a TCanonicalNumber Formatter format. Thus, the cited col. 15 methods do not convert a text representation of a number into a numeric representation, but instead convert a TCanonicalNumber Formatter format. Further, nowhere does the cited col. 15 disclose an assignment statement.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner found that Davis teaches set statements. Applicants traverse because the Specification describes assignment statements as statements that

move or copy digits from one location to another, such as "acquiring a numeric value from a message and assigning it to a program variable". (Specification, pgs. 8, 10). The cited cols. 9-10 mention that the TPositionalNumber format defines setter and getter statements. However, the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the convertor that transforms the text to a numeric representation or binary number uses an assignment statement as that term is defined and used in the Specification.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 4, 10, and 16 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Davis.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of the number's format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting steps.

The Examiner cited col. 5, lines 48-55 of Davis as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims, finding that Davis teaches not converting the text when the number is out of bounds. (Final Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 5 mentions that if the number formatter attempts to turn text to a number by itself, but is unable, it will see what the out of bounds number formatter can do and returns the better match of the two. Nowhere does this cited col. 5 disclose that if the text description does not convert into the description of the number's format is the subsequent mapping and conversion not performed. The cited col. 5 nowhere discloses or mentions failure to convert text into a description of the number's format. Instead, the cited col. 5 mentions that if the attempt to turn text to a number alone fails, then another out of bounds formatter is invoked.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Davis.

2.   Claims 2, 8, and 14 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, and 14 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Turpin (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,898).

Applicants submit that claims 2, 8, and 14 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons

discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

3.   Claims 3, 9, and 15 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Omori (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0086861). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that claims 3, 9, and 15 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Claims 3, 9, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that wherein the text representation of the number is converted into a description of the number's format by a translate instruction using a translate table.

The examiner cited pg. 11, para. [0166] of Omori as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 5, 10) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0166] mentions that text data of sequence information on a complete set of DNA can be converted into binary form by using a table. However, these dependent claims additionally require using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. The cited para. [0166] does not teach this additional requirement because para. [0166] discusses converting a text of a DNA sequence into binary form using a table. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited combination.

4.   Amended Claims 5, 11, and 17 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 11, and 17 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Bratt (U.S. Patent No. 4,525,780). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that claims 5, 11, and 17 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons

discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Amended claims 5, 11, and 17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that the mapping of the description of the number's format to the converter comprises mapping the description of the number's format to an index which is used to transfer control to the converter corresponding to the description of the number's format.

Applicants amended these claims to integrate with the amendments made to the base claims concerning the converter.

The Examiner cited col. 66, lines 30-32 and col. 449, lines 2-7 of Bratt as teaching the claim requirement of mapping to an index. (Final Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 66 mentions that a hashing function maps information to index. The cited col. 449 mentions a procedure which takes an index and returns the character string defined for it.

Although the cited Bratt discusses mapping information to an index, the Examiner has not cited any part of Bratt or Davis that teaches or suggests mapping a description of a number's format to an index which is used to transfer control to the converter corresponding to the description of the number's format. Bratt's general discussion of mapping nowhere teaches this specific claimed mapping operation and the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis or other art that teaches the specific claimed mapping operation of mapping a description of a number's format to one of a plurality of convertors, where there is a correspondence of number format descriptions and converters.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 5, 11, and 17 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited combination.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-18 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for a one-month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 21, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984